

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Reconsideration and allowance in view of the foregoing amendment and the following remarks are respectfully requested.

Applicant and the undersigned wish to thank Examiner Patidar for the courtesies extended during the interview of May 31, 2006. The Amendments discussed during the interview have been presented above and the arguments made are repeated herein for the record.

Claims 1-2, 4, 6-22 and 25 are now pending. Claims 3-8, 10, 13, 16 and 19 had been withdrawn from further consideration as directed to non-elected species. Claims 3 and 5 have been canceled without prejudice. Generic claims remain. It is therefore respectfully requested that the restriction requirement be reconsidered and withdrawn upon allowance of one or more generic claims.

The title of the invention was objected to as not being descriptive. The title has been revised above so as to be more clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed. Approval of the new title is requested. In the alternative, if the Examiner would prefer another title, it is respectfully requested that the title be revised by Examiner's Amendment or that an alternate title be proposed in the next Official Communication.

Original claims 1 and 4 were objected to as including noted informalities. Claims 1 and 4 have been revised as suggested by the Examiner. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection are requested.

Original claims 1-2, 4, 9, 11-12, 16, 18 and 20-24 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Suzuki et al in view of Ooki et al. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

The Examiner characterizes Suzuki as disclosing permanent magnets having an axially extending elliptic columnar surface but notes that Suzuki does not teach a central portion thicker than other portions nor any circumferentially extending concavity around the detector.

Suzuki shows part cylinder magnets that surround the rotation axis. Thus, in transverse cross-section, the magnets are part circles and in longitudinal section the magnets are straight. The Examiner is correct in his observation that Suzuki does not disclose a central portion thicker than other portions (Appln. claim 2) and does not teach or suggest a circumferentially extending concavity (Appln. claim 1). In this regard, claim 1 has been amended above to clarify the orientation of the circumferentially extending concavity, to wit the concavity or rut is curved in a plane that includes the rotation axis. As mentioned above, in longitudinal section Suzuki provides a straight magnet and thus there is no concave curve in a plane that includes the rotation axis.

The Examiner cites the secondary reference to Ooki as allegedly teaching the modification of Suzuki so as to meet the limitations of applicant's claims. Applicant respectfully submits, however, that Ooki has been misunderstood. Note in particular column 2 of Ooki, the description of Figure 3. As explained therein, curved surfaces 11 and 12 are curved around the rotation centerline with a shape that is curved in all planes normal to (perpendicular to) the rotation centerline and linear in all planes parallel to the rotation centerline. Ooki further explains that all surfaces other than the facing surfaces of the magnets are flat. It is therefore understood that Ooki does not teach or suggest a magnet that is curved in a plane including (or parallel to) the rotation axis. The noted passage of column 2 of Ooki clearly discloses that the surface of both magnets is linear (straight) in planes parallel to the rotation centerline.

Furthermore, regarding claim 2, it is clear that the Ooki magnets are uniformly thick along their length so that Ooki clearly does not meet the limitations of applicant's claims 2, 14, 17 and 25.


Therefore, even if Suzuki could be combined with Ooki, the invention of applicant's independent claims would still not be anticipated nor obvious.

Applicant notes with appreciation the Examiner's indication that claims 14, 15, 17 and 19 contain allowable subject matter. Claims 14, 15 and 17 have been re-presented in independent form above. It is therefore respectfully submitted that those claims should now be allowed.

All objections and rejections having been addressed, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance and an early Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

**NIXON & VANDERHYE P.C.**

By:   
Michelle N. Lester  
Reg. No. 32,331

MNL:slj  
901 North Glebe Road, 11th Floor  
Arlington, VA 22203-1808  
Telephone: (703) 816-4000  
Facsimile: (703) 816-4100